

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**LAZARO ABREAU-SUSET**  
*Petitioner, pro se*

**v.**

**JOHN SOMMERS, et al.**  
*Respondents*

**: CIVIL ACTION**  
**:**  
**:**  
**: NO. 15-6846**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 20<sup>th</sup> day of March 2018, upon consideration of the *Report and Recommendation* issued on February 26, 2018, by the Honorable David R. Strawbridge, United States Magistrate Judge (“the Magistrate Judge”), [ECF 13], to which no objections were filed,<sup>1</sup> it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The *Report and Recommendation* (the “R&R”) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;
2. Petitioner’s petition for a writ of *habeas corpus*, [ECF 1], is **DISMISSED** and **DENIED**; and
3. No probable cause exists to issue a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk of Court is directed to mark this matter **CLOSED**.

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro  
**NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO**  
*Judge, United States District Court*

---

<sup>1</sup> As of the date of this Order, none of the parties have filed any objection and/or response to the R&R. In the absence of any objections, this Court reviews an R&R under the “plain error” standard, *see Facyson v. Barnhart*, 2003 WL 22436274, at \*2 (E.D. Pa. May 30, 2003), to determine whether the Magistrate Judge committed any error that was “(1) clear or obvious, (2) affect[ed] ‘substantial rights, and (3) seriously affected the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.’” *See Leyva v. Williams*, 504 F.3d 357, 363 (3d Cir. 2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, after a thorough review of the record and the R&R, this Court finds no error was committed and, therefore, adopts the R&R in its entirety.